



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

AF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,890	08/13/2001	George B. McDonald	266/067	8163
27160	7590	02/17/2006	EXAMINER	
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 525 WEST MONROE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/928,890	MCDONALD ET AL.
	Examiner Sabiha Qazi	Art Unit 1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Final Office Action

Acknowledgement is made of the response filed on 11/07/2005. Amendments are entered. Claims 1 and 4-15 are pending. No claim is allowed. Rejection under 112 (1) is withdrawn because claims are amended.

Response to Remarks

Declaration

- The declaration filed by Applicants was not found persuasive because no criticality of invention was seen. All the data would have been expected in view of the teachings of the prior art at the time of invention. The claimed invention is considered a routine experimentation of the teaching of the prior art. Since the same compound, which is used for GVHD for the same population, maintains GVL no criticality of the invention was noted. The results shown about the doses, control of GVHD and better survival as summarized especially in sections 19-22 of the declaration are convincing however, it is unclear what is new in the instant claims, which was not previous claimed and/or taught by the prior art cited by the Examiner.
- Applicant is again requested to clearly point out if there is anything critical to their invention in view of prior art. If applicants have found the specific dose, condition or any other criticality, claims do not reflect that at all.
- The claimed invention is considered obvious from the point of patentably issue. Applicant is requested to make it clear that what is the real difference, if any between claimed

invention and prior art. In order to advance the prosecution Applicant may consider calling the Examiner to discuss the issues surrounding the claimed invention.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1 and 4-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,731. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in

instant application applicants are claiming a method of treating a patient with cancer to reduce symptoms of GVHD by using beclomethasone-17, 21-dipropionate as in claim 1.

3. Claimed invention in US '731 is drawn to a method for preventing tissue damage associated with GVHD by corticosteroid for a period of time following transplantation and prior to symptoms associated with graft-versus-host diseases (GVHD). Specific use of corticosteroid beclomethasone is claimed in claims 13-27, 39 and 40. Claimed invention is obvious over the claims of the issued patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 4-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDONALD et al., AN 1998323484 MEDLINE; DN PubMed ID: 9649455; Gastroenterology, 1998 July; 115 (1), 28-35. The reference teaches an effective treatment of for intestinal graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) by beclomethasone dipropionate (BDP). Furthermore, the reference teaches that oral BDP allowed more doses to be rapidly tapered without recurrent intestinal symptoms. See the abstract.

Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming to reduce or eliminate the symptoms while maintaining GVL reaction. The reference does not disclose about maintaining GVL reaction effective to eliminate or reduce the number of cancer cells in the blood of the said animal. It is assumed that when the symptoms are reduced GVL would be maintained.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to treat the patients having GVHD by beclomethasone 17, 21-dipropionate because prior art teaches the same method. Since the treatment is being done to the same population by the same compound it would maintain the GVL reaction as claimed. The results presented would have been expected in view of the teachings of the prior art of record. **If applicants have found the specific dose,**

condition or any other criticality, claims do not reflect that at all. Applicant is requested to clearly explain on record what is the criticality of the invention.

Normally, change in temperature, concentration, or both, is not a patentable modification; however, such changes may impart patentability to a process if the ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from results of prior art; such ranges are termed "critical" ranges, and applicant has burden of proving such criticality; even though applicant's modification results in great improvement and utility over prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art; more particularly, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller et al.* 105 USPQ 233.

It is well established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. *In re Becket*, 33 U.S.P.Q. 33 (C.C.P.A. 1937). *In re Russell*, 439 F.2d 1228, 169 U.S.P.Q. 426 (C.C.P.A. 1971).

In absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results instant invention is considered obvious over the prior art. See MPEP § 716.02 -§ 716.02(g) for a discussion of criticality and unexpected results.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Padmanabhan, Sreeni (acting) can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thursday, February 16, 2006



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER